State Dept. Admits Risk of Spreading Nuclear Arms, P. 2

The GOP Turned Into A Peace Party on Korea—It Might Again on Vietnam

Johnson and Humphrey, at a loss for a way out of the Vietnamese mess, ought to go back and take a hard look at what the Republicans did about Korea in the 1952 campaign. Then, as now, they began by talking tough. In the platform they adopted in July, 1952, they accused the Democrats of having "produced stalemate and ignominious bartering. . . . They offer no hope of victory." Then in the final hours of the campaign, the GOP did an about-face. On Oct. 24 Eisenhower cinched the election with his pledge to go to Korea and end the war. After accusing the Democrats of appeasement, the Republicans made peace.

Something similar may be brewing. On his yacht Aug. 27 Goldwater suddenly suggested peace talks with Red China. "Any President should always be interested in negotiations," he said. "That's the way to end wars. I've thought for some time that a talk like that with the Red Chinese might be profitable." Maybe this was just another eccentric remark from an eccentric candidate. But it resembled the equally sensational proposal by Clare Boothe Luce, one of Goldwater's principal advisers, in her speech June 14 at St. John's University. "While the key to peace in Europe still lies in Moscow," Mrs. Luce said, "today the key to peace in Asia lies in Peking. Let us be no less ready, and no more afraid, than our allies to discuss ways of relaxing tension with Mao Tse-tung." From so ferociously right wing a lady, this was indeed a surprise.

It's time for a new tack. That "show of strength" in Tonkin Bay was followed by the collapse of our pet Khanh regime, demonstrating again that bombings in the North cannot solve the hard political problems in the South. Behind the anti-Catholic riots was resentment against a fanatical minority which wants continuation of the war. Soon we must assume power openly in Saigon, taking up the hopeless task of pursuing gnats with sledge-hammers which the French gave up ten years ago, or negotiate peace. Viable and face-saving terms are possible: an independent South Vietnam linked in a neutral belt with Cambodia and Laos is the National Liberation Front program. North Vietnam would be glad to underwrite it in return for resumption of trade with the South. If Johnson plunges instead into a new Korea, the Republicans will make the most of it.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 29 SEPTEMBER 7, 1964 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Why We Support Johnson and Humphrey

Like Atlantic City's Steel Pier, with fun for young or old, the Democratic convention under the new LBJ brand had something for almost everybody, except the Daughters of the Confederacy, and it would not surprise me if the indefatigable Ladybird paid them a visit soon as a consolation prize. Everybody complained but everybody secretly had a good time, including the youngsters who sat on the boardwalk for hours in support of the Mississippi Freedom Party delegation. Sympathetic bystanders brought them box lunches; a white woman from Virginia distributed salt water taffies among them with assurances of sympathy; and one lady from Mississippi, who seemed totally unaware of the civil rights struggle, came around to inquire if any were delegates from her part of the State, with whom she could have a cozy gossip about folks back home.

Mississippi's Isolation and Defeat

Humanity obtruded itself into this otherwise mechanical and controlled proceeding only on the Saturday afternoon before the convention opened when the Freedom Democratic Party's delegation pleaded its case before the credentials committee. There, under the able and devoted generalship of Joseph L. Rauh, the brave handful from Mississippi had a chance to give the convention and the television audience a glimpse into the realities of white supremacy in Mississippi. Even then the President soon shut them off from view when he preempted the networks in the middle of their presentation to make his talk to the Governors in Washington. To the managers of the convention the Freedom Party delegates were an unwelcome guest, though among the rank-and-file they commanded the widest sympathy. A floor fight would have expressed their moral revulsion against the murderous folkways of the deep South but it would also have torn the party apart. The efficacious mechanics of the Johnson-Humphrey team were demonstrated even before the Vice Presidential choice was announced. While Johnson sold the compromise package to the Southern delegates, Humphrey, with aid from Walter Reuther, kept the Freedom Democratic Party delegates from expressing their dissatisfaction too wildly.

From the standpoint of conventional politics, the compromise was an extraordinary victory for what began as little more than a publicity gimmick. From the standpoint of the cost the Freedom Party delegates may pay on their return,

(Continued on Page Four)

Planning Is Not A Dirty Word In Japan

"Paris, Aug. 30—The Western industrial powers declared today [in a report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] that the growth and performance of Japan's economy since World War II has been 'remarkable' . . . Japan has grown faster in the postwar years than any other non-Communist country, and approximately as fast as the Soviet Union in its best years. In its postwar recovery period, through 1953, Japan's total output grew by almost 11 percent a year. Since then it has averaged close to 9½ percent. . . . The principal lesson that the report drew from other countries was government planning. It said that the readiness of business to invest and expand itelf 'is thought in Japan to have been stimulated by the process of central economic planning,' because planning has strengthened business men's confidence in continued economic growth."

—New York Times financial page Aug. 31.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Five Congressmen Try to Stop New Atomic Exchange of Information Pact

State Department Admits It Risks The Spread of Nuclear Weapons

A new agreement for transferring nuclear information to NATO has provoked a minor rebellion in Congress. Just before recess for the Democratic convention, five congressmen (Kastenmeier, Rosenthal, Burton, Ryan of New York and Brown of California) submitted resolutions disapproving the agreement. It has yet to be shown, they argue, that the agreement "is essential to the military mission of NATO," "would not aid and abet the development" of national nuclear forces, and "would not contribute to the negotiation and execution" of an MLF.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy discouraged inquiry into these matters at its public hearing. Witnesses against the agreement (Women Strike for Peace, WILPF, and Rep. Rosenthal) were made to play the part of humble petitioners come before royalty. Rosenthal even received a gently chiding lecture on the select quality of the Joint Committee when he complained that Congress was being asked to approve an agreement whose contents it was not permitted to know.

Who's Pounding On Our Nuclear Door?

They can hardly be blamed for failing to ask some important questions. Rep. Holifield denied that "Germany was pounding on our door for more weapons." Rep. Hosmer claimed that past agreements "have stood in the way of extraordinary efforts on the part of some nations to obtain nuclear weapons." No one explored the possible contradiction. Senator Aiken said he "understood this agreement would permit us to give blueprints to NATO nations." Did his understanding come from the secret hearings? Were the blueprints for missiles? No one asked.

The Committee was more cooperative with Administration witnesses. Evasive answers went unchallenged. When Holifield asked Robert Shaetzel, Asst. Secretary of State for the Atlantic Community, whether the agreement would "be used as a means of transferring information to an MLF when and if it is established." Shaetzel answered, "No, there is nothing in this agreement designed to facilitate the negotiations now going on in Paris in connection with the MLF." One hopes the Committee listened more closely in its executive session.

An Ignored Soviet Offer

Too little attention has been paid revelations made by Matthew Meselson, a Harvard professor of Biology and a close student of disarmament, in his August 17 letter to The New York Times. Newspaper stories out of Geneva have left the impression that the Soviet Union will not agree to a treaty against dissemination of nuclear weapons until the United States abandons its plans to create a nuclear mixed-manned fleet (MLF). Meselson's study of the official verbatim record of the July 2nd conference reveals a different impression. The Soviet delegate, V. A. Zorin, told the conference, "If the Western Powers are really anxious for a positive solution to the problem of non-dissemination, we are prepared to negotiate . . . without putting forth any preliminary conditions." This would be good news were it not for the fact that some Administration officials have implied a willingness to relinquish our veto power over the firing of MLF missiles. This obviously would mean dissemination and therefore would be unacceptable to the Russians. "Would we guarantee to retain our veto," asks Meselson, "in order to obtain a nuclear non-dissemination agreement?"

The agreement, even if unrelated to MLF, is based on the same dangerous assumption that NATO can be held together with nuclear bait. Shaetzel, in an unusual lapse into candor, admitted this when asked the purpose of the agreement:

I think the foremost point I would like to stress is the continued commitment of the Administration to NATO and to having a more cohesive and effective alliance. We certainly have been persuaded as the years go by of the need to balance out the role of sharing on the part of members of the alliance, and the staff of NATO itself, with nuclear information, with retaining security of information and therefore not creating a situation which would see a further proliferation of national nuclear forces.

This short-sighted policy of risking nuclear proliferation for the sake of political unity is far too important to remain under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Joint Committee. Congress should seek a public debate and, in particular, should ask the Secretaries of State and Defense for a full report on just how close Germany and other NATO nations are to having independent nuclear capability. A Resolution of Inquiry, passed by either house, would compel them to answer.

"As Dangerous As Quenching Thirst With Salt Water"

"I appear here this morning in support of my resolution and three other similar resolutions expressing congressional disapproval of the proposed [NATO] agreement [on atomic information]. The pressures for the dissemination of nuclear information are still competitive pressures, not cooperative ones, and buying cohesion among nations with the currency of nuclear information is still as dangerous as quenching thirst with salt water because the short-run formula for survival may become in fact the ultimate cause of death.

"One fundamental question about this agreement is why is it needed, unless it is to usher in a major change in our NATO nuclear policy. Under this proposed agreement, for the first time we shall provide NATO with information for the development of delivery systems compatible with the atomic weapons which they carry. It would appear from the testimony of the other witness this morning [Asst. Secretary of State Shaetzel] that the United States is already providing this information under bilateral agreements and therefore that we should not object to the new agreement because on the face of it it is superfluous.

"However, it seems to me that under the proposed agreement, we are opening a backdoor approach to establishing MLF. We may find ourselves having established MLF without ever really intending to do so.

"If there is no legitimate reason for the agreement, if it is superfluous, if we have the bilaterals with the nine countries and we can give them all we want to give them under those agreements, why enact the agreement? If the administration's answer to that is that there are valid reasons for the agreement, let them show the necessity and that there are no undisclosed reasons for the agreement."

—Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal (D. N.Y.), before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Aug. 18 (abridged).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Morse Splits With Humphrey In Fight Over Foreign Aid

Liberals Join Southerners In Attacking Arms for Military Dictators

For three days a handful of Senators tried to eliminate the boondoggle that sits just beneath the surface of foreign aid. It was like attacking an iceberg with a rowboat. "The Senator from Minnesota [Humphrey] talks about the malaria program, the health program, and the farmers' cooperative. I'm all for it," said Senator Morse, "but these are only minor features of foreign aid. The Senator has not addressed himself to the bulk of the program."

The bulk, over $1 billion, is mostly military aid. Rep. Otto Passman recently called it "a dumping ground for excess military equipment" and suggested it was a way "to keep a certain industry alive in America." Morse sought to reduce it indirectly. His amendment would have given priority in economic aid to "those countries whose military budgets do not exceed their legitimate and reasonable needs." Among the few (17) Senators voting for it was Richard Russell, chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Only one other reform amendment received fewer votes. This would have outlawed aid to governments seizing power via military coups. Six Latin American Foreign Ministers told Morse that no single action could be more helpful to the Alliance for Progress. It was defeated 59-12.

A Guarantee for Gunrunning

The reformers, this time led by Ellender (*D. La.*), did succeeding in eliminating a new military aid provision that had the U.S. government underwriting credit sales of military equipment. "Why," asked Ellender, "should Fairchild, Douglas, General Motors or other large suppliers to our arsenal be allowed to encourage the sales of hardware to foreign nations with a full guarantee of the U.S. government" Senator Aiken (R. Vt.) was even more blunt. "If we guarantee gunrunning, we will likely find some people encouraging conflicts between countries."

A surprise amendment by Senator Proxmire has also put the oil lobby to work. It eliminates a $20-to-$35 million a year handout that AID and its predecessors have been giving for the past decade to seven major international oil companies. "AID virtually insists upon purchases of oil at posted prices," Proxmire told the Senate. A posted price is the artifically high price that integrated oil companies pay their affiliates in producing countries so that profits can be retained there where taxes are low. Proxmire's amendment requires AID to purchase oil at competitive prices, usually 20-40% below posted prices. Unexpected approval from Senator Fulbright, a sometime friend of the oil lobby, permitted the amendment to pass by a voice vote.

Few taxpayers realize that a large part of economic aid, called program loans, finances an artificial export market for American business. The exact nature of these loans is often undisclosed even to Senators. "If the Senator could get the details," Aiken explained to Morse, he would find this money goes "to pay off American creditors of foreign governments." Last year about two-thirds of development loan fund money, intended for specific projects like dams and roads, went instead for general program loans. Even the veteran Senator Douglas said he was "shaken" by this "unrefuted" information. Morse's amendment to curtail these loans was narrowly beaten 42-40. "The Senator from Alaska must not despair," he told Gruening. "We are making a little progress."

A Pyrrhic Victory?

House passage of the anti-reapportionment Tuck bill may have been a pyrrhic victory for rural conservatives. In order to report the bill to the floor for a vote, the Rules Committee had to rely on an obscure precedent which permits it to consider a bill even though it has not been reported out or even considered by one of the legislative committees, in this case, Judiciary. By his point of order challenging this action, Rep. O'Hara (D. Mich.) forced Speaker McCormack to establish the precedent anew. Now it can be used to pry liberal legislation like medicare from the clutches of conservative committee chairmen. The one stumbling block is the conservative Rules Committee. Originally the Committee worked in harmony with the House leadership because both were elected by party caucus. Now that committee's posts are filled by seniority. When the 89th Congress convenes, the liberals will seek a return to elections.

Congress Establishes Automation Commission That Could Be Planning Board

The President recently signed into law a National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress. The legislation is careful not to say so explicitly, but it in fact creates a national economic planning board, the first civilian one of its kind in our history. The Commission has authority to assess (although none to enforce) "the most effective means for channeling new technologies into promising directions, including civilian industries . . . and [to] assess the proper relationship between governmental and private investment in the application of new technologies to large-scale human and community needs." One indication of the President's commitment to the war on poverty will be the man he appoints to head the Commission. Another will be his efforts to extend its life. Its final report is scheduled for January, 1966.

Other legislation lost in the flood of convention news is the Freedom of Information Bill which has passed the Senate but faces pigeonholding in the House Judiciary Committee. The present disclosure statute for administrative agencies contains loopholes so broad that, according to the Senate Judiciary's report, "it is cited as authority for withholding virtually any piece of information that an official or an agency does not wish disclosed." The new bill, sponsored by Senator Long (D. Mo.), would replace the vague withholding standard of "public interest" with the more specific one of "national security." It would also require regulatory agencies to disclose the votes of individual commissioners. Voting in secret, as is regularly done by the SEC, invites obvious abuse.

The new Housing Bill is less admirable. It contains no provision that would prohibit the building of luxury housing on slum-cleared land. Rep. Farbstein's attempt to include one was defeated by a voice vote after the influential Albert Rains, chief architect of the federal housing program, said it was "totally incompatible to build extremely low-cost housing on extremely high-cost land." Incompatible with what? The profits of the nation's landlords and slumlords or an end to Harlem and "The Jungle."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LBJ's Choice of Humphrey Indicates His Ultimate Direction

(Continued from Page One)

and the hypocrisy about a "legality" that is only legalized fraud and race oppression, the compromise looked too much like another offer of tokenism, and of separate but unequal representation. There was talk of mass civil disobedience, and of several hundred going to jail. This might have sparked the kind of outburst in Atlantic City that happened a few days later in Philadelphia, with irremediable harm to the Negro and the nation. As it was, the affair ended with Mississippi isolated from the rest of the South, Alabama split, and Bull Connor led off from the floor in humiliation. Georgia with four Negroes in its delegation became the symbol of a new moderate South, and leverage has been provided for open Democratic parties in 1968.

The Savage Within Us

There are three main objectives to be sought in this election and it's not going to be easy to keep our minds firmly on them amid the pulling and hauling on specific issues. One is to defeat Goldwaterism so overwhelmingly as to demonstrate for a long time to come that the American people, of all classes and origins, are opposed to the irruption of Fascistic elements into our political system. The second is to make progress on the racial front with a minimum of trouble. Everywhere we look in the world we see how murderously men hate each other across the divisions of color, race, religion or tribe; the bloody riots in Vietnam are only the latest evidence of the savage within us.

Our country is doing more about racism than any other country in the world. To the extent that the South can be cajoled, coaxed, and persuaded peacefully, we are all the gainers. This is what Johnson is doing, and it is important that this Southerner emerge from the election not rejected by his own section but with considerable Southern support. This means to unite, rather than divide, the country. In this respect Johnson is not just a superb political tactician but serving the highest national and human purposes. If the platform is tepid on civil rights, if it gives some semantic comfort to the South, that's worth the acquiescence it purchases.

The CIA Just Can't Resist A Bargain

That CIA Board of National Estimates paper by Willard Matthias, which leaked to the Chicago Tribune, and made headlines about a possible neutral solution in Vietnam is open for inspection by newsmen at the State Department. One remarkably sensible passage has not been reported in the press. "Despite any disinclination to get involved in crises or any interest in a detente which may exist," Matthias wrote, "the situation in most of the underdeveloped world is so disorderly that many situations are likely to develop from which the great powers will have difficulty remaining aloof or which they will have difficulty controlling if they get involved. Individuals or groups calling themselves Castroites or Communists might stage revolutionary attempts or initiate guerrilla movements not on the orders of Moscow, Peiping or Havana but in the hope of gaining their support. Similarly individuals or groups may organize or execute plots simply to gain U.S. support. Once outside powers do become involved, whether by accident or design, crises can develop which will engage their prestige to a degree incommensurate with the intrinsic or strategic value of the area itself." The paper concludes, "One consequence of this disorder and of inhibitions upon open involvement is likely to be an increase in clandestine activities designed to influence the course of events." Then it recommends such activities because of their low cost among other things!

In any case the Negro has the new Civil Rights Act and a vice-presidential candidate who has been his firmest champion in the Senate.

No man deserved the nomination more; none has worked harder for liberal causes; Humphrey's choice by Johnson for the succession creates confidence in LBJ's ultimate direction, especially in the third great objective. That is slowly to bring this country back to a sense of reality, to face up to its limited power and to adjust in Vietnam and Cuba to change. Peace is the third great objective. I believe Johnson will move toward it, and that when he picked the chief architect of the nuclear test ban treaty as his running mate, he gave evidence of where he really stands on this issue, too.

A Sub to the Weekly Is An Ideal Gift for the Boy or Girl Going Off to College.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

9/7/64

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED